

SOME

1578/6580

A C C O U N T

OF THE

C A S E

BETWEEN

ELIZABETH CANNING,

A N D

MARY SQUIRES;

As it now stands upon the Foot of the Evidence given on both Sides, upon the late Trial at the *Old-Bailey*.

*Tu, simul obligasti
Perfidum votis caput ; enitefcis
Cavlor multo ; Stolidumque prodis,
Publica cura.*

*— Nil fuit unquam,
Sic impar sibi.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for the AUTHOR, and Sold by C. CORBETT,
opposite St. Dunstan's Church, Fleet-street. MDCCLIV.

[Price One Shilling.]

SOME

ACCOUNT

OF THE

CASA E

BETWEEN

ELIZABETH CANNING

AND

MARTIN SQUIER

As it now stands upon the Foot of the Hill-
dence given on both sides upon the last
Bill at the Old-Battery.



By the Council of the City of London,
in the presence of the Mayor,
and the Aldermen, and the Common Council,
in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and

seventy and eight.

Witness my hand this

LONDON

Printed for the Author, and Sold by C. Gougeon,
at the Sign of the Crown, in the Strand.
[Printed by C. Gougeon.]

SOME

ACCOUNT, &c.

TH E Dispute whether *Elizabeth Canning* was an Impostor or not, after having engaged the Attention of half the Kingdom for more than a Twelvemonth, is at length brought to an Issue. This Girl, whose Name will be perhaps as famous Ages hence as those of Kings and Heroes, who, by a Series of great Actions, have done Honour to themselves and to their Country, though on a far different Account, as she would never have deserved Remembrance but for the absurd Improbabilities of her most amazing Tale, and the more amazing Credulity with which it was believed, has been convicted of wilfully and

B

corruptly

corruptly swearing, " That she was robbed of
 " her Gown, Apron, and Money, in *Moor-*
 " *fields* by two Men, who, after stripping
 " her, knocked her down, and then carried
 " her to *Susannah Wells's* House at *Enfield-*
 " *Wash* (she in a Fit almost all the Time)
 " and that she was there robbed of her Stays
 " by *Mary Squires*, who shoved her up se-
 " ven or eight Stairs into a Room by the
 " Kitchen, where she remained confined
 " from Four o'Clock in the Morning of the
 " second of *January* 1753, till Four in the
 " Afternoon of the 29th of that Month,
 " when she escaped by forcing down some
 " Boards nailed before a Window, and got
 " safe Home to her Mother's, which is above
 " eleven Miles distant, without stopping,
 " having had nothing to eat or drink during
 " her whole Confinement, except about
 " twenty-four old Crusts, which might be
 " a Quartern Loaf in Quantity, and four or
 " five Quarts of Water in a broken Jugg—
 " and without having been ever visited, or
 " even looked after by any Person whatso-
 " ever for a Month together."

The universal Declaration of those who
 believed the Girl before the Trial was, " If
 " she is proved guilty, we will give her up
 " for no Punishment can be too bad for such
 " an Impostress." Guilty she has been
 proved, but nothing can convince those who
 are

are determined to shut their Eyes against the Light, they remain as much attached as ever to the Girl; and why? The Court was partial, the Jury were partial, the Witnesses against the Girl were all perjured to a Man—and her Innocence was notwithstanding proved most clearly—To think of reasoning with Men like these, were greater Madness than the famed St. *Anthony's* converting Sprats to Christianity.

But there are another Set of People, honest, humane, and somewhat credulous, who, having taken the Girl's Part from worthy Motives, cannot easily get over strong Prepossessions—Gypsies, Bawds, and Whores, they know are Parties on one Side, and these they not only think capable of any Villainy, but believe they must be guilty of every one they are charged with. *Canning*, on the other Hand, is a poor young Girl, of whom they never heard any Harm, and therefore suppose it is impossible she should ever do any.

It is common to hear these People declare, they are by no Means satisfied with the Verdict, and that the Trial, which, they were told, would clear up the whole Affair, has left them as much in the Dark as ever; and how should it be otherwise? They did not hear the Girl tried, nor can they read her Trial before it is printed, which may be some

Time first. And what is infinitely worse, nineteen Parts in twenty of all the Relations they have heard about it, have been errant Falshoods invented by the ridiculous Folly of some, and the mean Designs of others, on Purpose to mislead them. It is therefore to undeceive those whose Minds are open to Conviction, that the Author of these Sheets, who was present during the greatest Part of the Trial, and is not unacquainted with what passed when he was absent, has taken Pen in Hand. He intends not to involve himself in a Labyrinth of Arguments about the Probability or Improbability of the Girl's Story, but merely to give a general Idea of the Evidence offered at the *Old Bailey* on both Sides, interspersed with a few Reflections and explanatory Remarks, to those who either do not care to wait till the Publication of the Trial, or who, when published, could not, or would not, afford the Time necessary to read it with Attention.—But, to proceed.

The Jury being impannelled, the Indictment opened, and Evidence given of what *Canning* had sworn upon the Trial, *George Squires*, the Gypsey's Son, was examined to prove that his Mother was at *Abbotbury* at the Time *Canning* swore she was robbed by her. This he accordingly did, beginning below *Abbotbury*, and traced her Journey with

with him up from Stage to Stage, very exactly, till he brought her to *Enfield-Wash* on the 24th of *January* 1753; but being cross-examined what Road he had taken in his Way from *London* to *Abbotsbury* in the Autumn before, he gave a most imperfect Account of it, he could only say in general, that he travelled through the Wilds of *Kent* and *Sussex*, and so through *Hampshire*, but could hardly mention the Name of a single Town he had been at all the Way. As this was thought very extraordinary at that Time, and has been much talked of since, it requires some particular Explanation; in order to which it will be necessary to inform the Reader, that *George Squires*, the Son, used heretofore to travel the Country with an Hawker's and Pedlar's Licence, and dealt in Lawns, Muslins, Handkerchiefs, &c. But in Autumn 1752, not being able to afford a Licence, he set out without one, his Mother and Sister *Lucy* accompanying him, and, as he was doubly liable to be taken up and whipped as a Vagabond, first for peddling without a Licence, and, secondly, for travelling the Country as a Gypsey, it was highly necessary for him to avoid as much as possible getting into any Corporation, or even Market-Town. There is also another Reason common, to all Pedlars, for passing through few Towns, except small inconsiderable

derable Villages lying out of great Roads, which is, that, in all considerable Towns, there are Shopkeepers able to supply the Necessities of the Inhabitants, who will not buy of rambling Strangers what they may have better and cheaper of their Neighbours. But in remote Villages the Case is far different, the People there having frequently no Market within many Miles of them, are glad to snatch any Opportunity of procuring such Things as they must otherwise send a great Way for; and perhaps trust the buying of to Persons unskilful enough to be easily imposed on: Thus *George Squires*, being got into *Kent* in his Way from *London*, had nothing to do with the Towns of Note; and, as it was indifferent to him whether a Village, where he sold his Goods, was called *A* or *B*, it was usual with him (as it is with all Pedlars) never to trouble his Head about their Names at all, but only at one Village, to ask which was the Way Westward to the next. And this (added to the egregious Stupidity of *George Squires*, which it may, with great Truth, be said was never doubted of by any Body who ever conversed with him) may serve to account, very reasonably, for his giving so lame an History of his Journey from *London* downwards.

But there is another Difficulty behind; since he gave so bad an Account of his Expedition

petition to *Abbotbury*, how came he so particularly to relate the Stages and Circumstances of his Return? The Answer is easy; he had sold all his Goods at *Abbotbury*, and therefore had nothing to do but to return to *London* the nearest Way. He had also received Advice that his Sister *Mary* was ill in Town, and this hastened his Journey back. So much for his coming Home by the strait Road. As to his particular Memory relating to that Road, Nobody can wonder at it who is told, that not above ten Days after his Arrival at *Susannah Wells's*, he was forced to travel it over again to fetch Witnesses from *Abbotbury* to save his Mother's Life, with whom he returned to *London*; and since then he has been down at every Place he stopped at in the first Journey with his Mother, in the Company of Mr. *Willis* of *Dorchester*, and refreshed his Memory as to Circumstances, by conversing with the several People who had before seen the whole Family on the Road; and it would have been miraculous indeed if he could not have given a more perfect Account of a straight Post-Road, which he had travelled five Times over, and four of them with sufficient Reasons to remark it, than he could of a rambling Journey through cross Roads and bye Villages, which he had no particular Reason to retain in his Head.

After *Squires*, many other Witnesses, living at different Places in the Country, were examined, who proved that the Gypsey had travelled from *Litton* on the 31st of *December* with her Son and Daughter towards *Abbotsbury*, that she arrived there on *New Year's-Day*, and staid there till the 9th, and that her Son and Daughter danced there in a large Company, with an astonishing Variety of other Circumstances; and it is remarkable that all the Witnesses in general, who were brought to prove the Gypsey was not at *Enfeld-Wash* in the Beginning of *January*, to the Number of 40, swore positively not only to her, but to her Son and Daughter *Lucy*; that they were almost to a Man People of irreproachable Characters; that every one of them had not only seen, but conversed familiarly with her and her Family, and that many of them had known her for one, two, three, or more, and some for thirty Years before that Time. Amongst other Witnesses from *Abbotsbury* was *Gibbon*, who keeps the *Ship Inn* there, and it deserves Notice, that, upon the original Trial of the Gypsey, he, being asked how he could fix the Time when she was at his House, said one *Andrew Wick*, or *Wicks*, came there the same Day as an Exciseman in the Stead of the ordinary Exciseman who was ill. Now at that Time it was impossible that *Gibbon* could
 know,

know, or conceive, that *Canning's* Affair would undergo such a strict Review as has since happened, and therefore he could not have thought of preparing *Wick* to corroborate, in any future Time, what he then said; from whence the Conclusion was very evident, that, if *Wick* should afterwards corroborate what *Gibbon* swore, it would amount almost to a Demonstration, that they both spoke the Truth. This has happened. *Wick* has not only appeared, and proved that the Gypsey, her Son, and Daughter, were really at *Abbotsbury*, with a great Variety of Circumstances, which could not have been concerted nor proved, unless Truth had been their Basis, but in Confirmation of what he said, the Books were produced from the Excise-Office, which incontestably shew that he really was at *Abbotsbury* from the first to the fourteenth of *January*, exactly corresponding with *Clark's* Evidence given fifteen Months ago, without the Possibility of Concert or Connexion with him.

From *Abbotsbury* the Witnesses traced the Gypsey and her Family through various Places where they stopped, to *Coombe*; from thence to *Dorchester*, and from thence to *Basingstoke*.

Here a remarkable Incident happened, which well deserves Notice. *Lucy Squires*,

C

when

when at *Abbotsbury*, had entered into a Love-Affair with one *Clark*, who was also a Witness upon the Trial. Unable to write herself, she got a Woman at this Town to write a Letter to *Clark* for her; the Letter fell into the Hands of another Person of the Name, and was returned to the Post-Office. By this Means it was procured, and produced in Court; it alluded to some particular Circumstances before proved by other Witnesses; and the Woman who wrote it also appeared, and gave Evidence of that Fact, and the Time it was written. Part of the Date of the Year was indeed accidentally torn off, but that Defect was supplied as well by the Evidence of the Woman who wrote it, as by the Post-Mark, and other Evidences too certain to be denied, and which will be explained fully in the printed Trial

From *Basingstoke*, *Squires's* March to *Brentford*, and from thence, on the 23d of *January*, to the *Seven Sisters*, within about six Miles of *Enfield-Wash*, was most clearly proved.

Having gone through this Part of the Evidence against *Canning*, the Reader ought to be informed, that the Dates of Times when the Gypsey was proved to be at so many different Places by forty Witnesses, all exactly corresponded with each other, insomuch that
where

[II]

where one Witness set her down another takes her up; that these Witnesses live remote from each other, and have no Connexions or Correspondence together; and, lastly, that, as they swear to three Persons all very well known to them, and fix the Time by Tokens which cannot err, it is impossible that they can be mistaken; and therefore, if they have sworn falsely, they are every Soul of them guilty of the most horrid Perjury; a Position never to be granted, more especially when we consider, that many of them swear to their being in Company together when they saw the Gypsey, and therefore, if that had been false, they must have been liable to contradict each other on a Cross-Examination, and thereby subject themselves to Detection; the contrary of which happened, for every Witness, by the exact Concurrence of his Testimony, strongly confirmed the Evidence of those who had been examined before; some few seeming Variations indeed there were, too few, and too inconsiderable, to have at all impeached the general Credit of the Evidence, had they even been irreconcilable. But that was not the Case, for those Variations arose only from Mistake, or the Defect of asking a few Questions, which would have explained them.

To instance in one or two, and hardly more than one or two there were.

Some of the Witnesses swore, That they dined with the Gypsey upon a Couple of Fowls and Bacon : But one Witness swore he dined with them, and there was but half a Fowl. The Fact was, he came in after the rest had dined, and the Victuals were removed ; upon his coming, half a Fowl, which they had left, was set before him, and was all the Provision he saw.

A Miller at *Dorchester* swore he saw *Mary Squires* and her Son both wading through the Water there ; but owned he did not see them till they were got *almost* through. Now *George Squires* swore he carried his Mother *through* upon his Back : Had he been asked if he carried her all the Way, he would have said no ; for in Truth he carried her till he was tired with her Weight ; and then being got over the deepest Part, he set her down to wade through the shallow Water.

It was in the next Place proved incontestably, That before Alderman *Chitty*, *Canning* swore she had been carried by two Men through *Bishopsgate-Street* ; That she had been confined in a little, square, dark, or darkish Room, with nothing in it but a Grate in a Chimney, a few old Pictures over the Chimney, an old Table, and an old broken

broken Stool or two; That she lay on the bare Boards, and that *she left some of the Water* behind her in the Pitcher, and that she got out of the Window upon a Shed, or Pent-house of Boards, down which she slid, and jumped from the Edge of it upon a Bank. It was also proved, That before Mr. *Fielding* she swore she drank *all her Water* three Days before she escaped: And on the Trial of *Squires* she swore *she drank the last of it about half an Hour before she got out*: And though before Alderman *Chitty* she swore to her being carried through *Bishopsgate-Street*, yet in Court she swore she fell into a Fit in *Moorfields*, and knew nothing that happened from that Time till within a Quarter of an Hour of her reaching Mother *Wells's*.

The Room she described at first as a little square one, was proved to be above thirty-five Feet long, and only nine Feet eight Inches wide, it was shewn to be a Lean-to the House, with several Beams or Girders running cross it, and without any Ceiling, or other Covering than the Tiles; it had no Table or Stools in it; on the first of *February*, when *Canning* went down to apprehend Mother *Wells*, it had no Grate in the Chimney, nor even any Hearth there; but the whole Chimney was full of old Cobwebs, so that no Grate could possibly have been
been

been there, though she had sworn she took a Bed-gown out of one ; it had no Pictures over the Chimney, nor could have had, for there were no Nail-holes, nor the Marks of any, but in the Place where they must have been, had they been there at all, there was an old Glass Casement joined to the Wall by Cobwebs. The Room had a light Casement Window without any fastening, large enough for a Person to get through with Ease ; and which *Canning* being asked why she did not get out of, said she believed was fastened, though she owned she had never tried. It had a Hole into the Kitchen for a Jack-Line to pass through, and which was large enough to survey the whole Kitchen, and observe every Thing that passed in it ; and over the Hole there was an old Jack-Weight and Pullies ; it had in it half a Load of Hay put there the Autumn before ; also two old Signs, a very * large Nest of Drawers joined to the Wall by Cobwebs ; three or four old Saddles, and many other Particulars ; not one of all which she described, till carried into the Room ; and there neither was, nor ever had been any Shed or Pent-house, nor any Thing else that could possibly be mistaken for one under either of the Windows.

All the above Particulars were fully proved : As also, that when she was carried
down

* Six Feet high, see a Plan of the Room just published.

down she was taken into the Kitchen, and set first on a Dresser, and then on a Chair in it, for near twenty Minutes in the whole; that both her Seats were in full View of the Work-shop, the Door of which was all the Time wide open, and yet she never shewed the least Sign of her knowing the Room she had said she was confined in, nor even said a single Word; but on the contrary suffered herself to be taken out of the Kitchen, up the House Stair-case, and into every Room in the House to find it; that at last being carried into the Work-shop, she turned towards the right Hand, where was the Fire-place, and looking that Way said not a Word; but on turning the other Way, and seeing the Hay, said she believed that was the Room.

In order to explain the last Particular about her owning the Room on seeing Hay, it must be remarked, that several Persons went down to *Enfield Wash* on the first of *February*, above an Hour before *Canning* got there; and that some of them objecting to the Work-shop's being the Room in which *Canning* could have been confined on account of the Hay, and other Particulars, one *Sker-rat* (whomakes a shining figure in the subsequent Parts of her Story) tossed up with one *Adamson*, who should go back to inquire of *Canning* about this Room; the Lot fell to
Adam-

Adamson; he accordingly went, and soon after return'd, saying, "Huzza! we are all right yet, for she says there is a little Hay in the Room."

A Midwife was also produced, who prov'd that *Canning's* Mother shewed her the Shift in which her Daughter came Home, and that it was not dirty enough to have been worn by a cleanly Person in her ordinary Business above a Week. She also proved, that there were no Stains upon it, except three little Spots of Excrement, and that, upon her expressing Surprise at it, *Canning's* Mother told her, her Daughter had not had her Courses for three or four Months before she was carried away. The Midwife also prov'd, that the Shift had no Dirt at all at the Bottom of it.

N. B. This Shift was never afterwards produced either in Court, or to any Person whatsoever, neither did *Canning*, or her Friends, ever produce, or give any Reason for not producing, the Shoes, Stockings, or Petticoats she had on when she came Home, which, as it happened to be a very wet Night, and almost in the Midst of Winter, must have been in a very dirty Condition, had her Story been true, and would therefore have been a very material Evidence in her Behalf.

The Council for the Prosecution then proceeded to shew, that *Canning* never was
at

at Mother *Wells's* House in the Month of *January*, and, for that Purpose, they called several Witnesses, who gave Evidence to the following Effect.

First, *Fortune Natus* and *Judith* his Wife proved that they lay in the Room in which *Canning* pretended she had been confined, from the *Monday* Fortnight after the Lord-Mayor's Day 1752, till the first of *February* 1753, when *Squires* and *Wells* were taken up.

Next, a Person was examined who bought the Irons out of a Sign-Post belonging to *Wells*, and fetched the Post from under *Natus's* Bed in the Workshop, on the 18th of *January*, in order to draw the Irons out of it. This Evidence was confirmed as to Time by a Person who joined in a Note of Hand with him on the 8th of that Month, which was to be paid in ten or twelve Days, and he was going to *Wormleigh* to borrow Money to discharge the Note when he called for the Sign-Post, which he delivered to his Son to carry Home. The Son was also examined, and confirmed his Father's Evidence, as did also *Judith Natus*, who happened to be in Bed at the Time.

Susannah Wells's two Daughters also prov'd that they had frequently been in the Room in *January*.

A poor labouring Man proved, he used to go to *Wells's* four or five Nights in a Week in that Month to spend the Evenings with *Natus* and his Wife, and frequently saw them go into, and come out of the Room, though he never was in it himself.

A Journeyman Carpenter proved, that he left his Tools in the Lumber-Room on the 19th of *January*, and fetched them out again the 20th.

Three Persons proved, that they were lopping a Tree behind Mrs. *Wells's* House the 8th of *January*, and saw *Sarah Howit* and *Virtue Hall* look out at the little Window of the Workshop, and that they had a pretty long Conversation with them. In this they were confirmed by *Sarah Howit*, who is one of *Wells's* Daughters. The Time sworn to by the three last Witnesses was fully confirmed by a Publican of Character, who lives near Mrs. *Wells*, and who also proved, that the Hay was put into the Workshop in the preceding Autumn.

A Woman, who keeps a Chandler's Shop directly opposite to Mrs. *Wells's*, proved, that she never saw the Gypsey there, or any where else, till the 24th of *January*, which she must have done if they had lodged there any considerable Time. She also proved, that, from the 24th to their being taken up, they constantly bought Bread and Small-Beer, and other Things, at her House. After

After this, the Defendant's Council proceeded to examine several Witnesses in her Defence.

And first they produced her old Master to prove her going from his House on *New-Years-Day*, and not coming back again, his Enquiries after her, and her being absent till the 29th of *January*. He gave the Girl an exceeding good Character, which had the greater Weight, as he himself bears a very fair one, and is generally esteemed. He shewed himself indeed to be a Man of ready Faith, as he owned he gave entire Credit to the Girl's Story at first, and had never once doubted the Truth of it since, merely because he believed she would not tell a Lye, without any other Reason whatsoever, having never, even to this Day, taken the Pains to examine her about it, or so much as to ask her a single Question.

One Thing deserves Notice, which is, that, on his Cross-Examination, he owned (tho' seemingly with great Unwillingness) that, before *Canning* came Home, he heard (but could not say from whom) that her Mother had been to a Conjuror to enquire about her Daughter, and was told she was in the Care of an old Woman, and would soon come Home safe.

Canning's Uncle and Aunt proved, that she drank Tea, and supped with them on

New-Year's-Day; that they went with her down *Houndsditch* about Nine o'Clock, and left her within a few Yards of *Bishopsgate*; that they were waked by the Mother's Apprentice about Twelve o'Clock at Night, who was sent to enquire after her; that the Mother came herself upon the same Errand the next Morning; that they all made great Enquiry, but could hear nothing of her till the 29th of *January* at Night. The Aunt also proved, that *Canning* was extremely ill, faint, and wasted when she came Home, and that she continued so for a long Time.

Canning's Mother swore, that, when her Daughter went away, she took half a Guinea, three Shillings, and a Farthing out of her Pocket, and shewed them to her, and that learning, after her Daughter was lost, that she had changed a Shilling and spent Three-pence of it, she computed that she had twelve Shillings and Nine-pence remaining in her Pocket, and advertised accordingly. She own'd that, at the Instant her Daughter came in, she was upon her Knees praying that she might see her Daughter, or her Apparition, and that she had bid the Apprentice do the same. But she said (and was confirmed in it by the Apprentice) that that was not the first Time, she having frequently done the same Thing before. She said she sent Bills to the *Moravians*, *Methodists*, several *Presbyterians*, and Ministers

Ministers of the established Church, to pray for her Daughter's Return. She owned going to the Conjurer, and believed he might say something about the Girl's being with an old Woman, and that she would soon return. She expressly swore, when her Daughter came in, she had no Cap upon her Head, nor any Thing but an old white Handkerchief and a ragged red one tied over it; whereupon it was proved, that, upon the Trial of *Squires*, she had sworn her Daughter, when she came Home, had a Cap, a Bedgown, &c. on. She also proved, that her Daughter learnt at School to read and write, and, being shewn some Notices, signed *Eliz. Canning*, which had been lately sent to the Solicitor for the Prosecution, said, she believed the Name was *her Daughter's Hand*; *Canning's* Information before Mr. *Fielding* was now produced, dated in *February* was Twelvemonth, and signed by the Girl with her *Mark, E. C. only*.

The Mother's Apprentice confirmed the former Evidence, and said, on *Canning's* coming Home, her Mother fell into a Fit, which had also been sworn by the Mother. He also swore, that immediately on coming Home, the Girl declared she had been at Mother *Wells's*, and that before any Company came into the House. He also swore, that her Arms and Face looked very black,

black, and being called upon to explain how black, said, "As black as your Hat."

Mr. R—— S—— was also produced, and, as his Evidence was curious, the Reader will peruse some Account of it with Attention.

He was the first Man who went into Mrs. *Canning's* House after her Daughter came Home, but he went purely out of Curiosity on hearing she was returned; for he had never seen her, or her Mother, in all his Life before, though he owned he lived next Door to the Mother for some Years. When he went in, he found there two or three Women, he asked her some Questions, but she would not give any Answer till Mr. *Wintlebury*, an Alehouse-keeper, with whom *Canning* was formerly a Servant, came in; but upon his Arrival, S—— asked her, where have you been? "Somewhere upon the *Hertfordshire* Road, for I saw the *Hertford* Coachman pass by." How far off was you? "About nine or ten Miles." Then Mr. S—— immediately said, I'll lay you a Guinea to a Farthing she has been at Mother *Wells's*; she replied, she believed she had, for she heard the Name of *Wills* or *Wells* mentioned; asking what Sort of a Woman she was, she answered, that a tall black swarthy old Woman cut off her Stays; upon which S—— said, that can't be Mother *Wells*, for she don't answer that Description. He swears that she then

then said, she had been confined in a long dark Room, *and that there was some Hay in it*. It will appear by the Trial, that he was also present at *Canning's* Examination before Alderman *Chitty*, and that though he had before declared the Woman, whom *Canning* described, could not be Mother *Wells*, yet he was a Witness to the granting a Warrant against her for cutting off the Girl's Stays, and went himself with the other Persons to execute it: That, when *Canning* was carried into *Wells's* Kitchen the first Time he was not with her, but that when she was taken into it the second Time (after she had been carried into every other Room in the House) the Door leading to the Workshop being then shut, she immediately pointed to the Door, and said, that is the Door of the Room I was carried into. He also relates a great Number of extraordinary Circumstances, more than are necessary to enumerate here; but, being cross-examined, he first says, he knew Mother *Wells's* *by passing by it*: He then owns he might have been in it once or twice—What, not three Times? Perhaps he might—What, not four Times? He could not tell—What, not five Times? He could not remember—Could he say, upon his Oath, he had not been there ten Times? He believed he could swear he had not—Had he been there eight Times? Really
it

it was a great while ago, and he could not remember how often he had been there ; and at last he would not take upon him to say he had not been ten Times in the House, but declared he had never been in any Rooms but the Parlour and Kitchen. Being asked how he came to be so certain at once that *Canning* had been at *Wells's*, said, it was because he knew it was a notorious bad House. Upon being asked, how he came to ask the Girl such a String of leading Questions as are before mentioned ? he said it was to find out if she had been at *Wells's*. Being asked if he thought that was a proper Method of finding it out, he said he did ; and, on being asked several other Questions upon the same Subject, he owned, that, in every one of his Questions, he mentioned some Particulars which he knew corresponded with the Situation of *Wells's* House ; that *Canning's* Answer to every Question was constantly " Yes ; that she did not say No to any one Question he asked her ; that he did not ask her one general Question, but all leading ones ; and that he never thought of asking her whether she had not observed Things in the Neighbourhood of Mother *Wells's*, which he knew were not to be found there, in order to discover whether she would not have said yes to them too. He was asked whether he did not swear upon the Trial of *Mary Squires*, that the Ac-

count

count *Canning* then gave was the same with that she had before given to the sitting Alderman. This Question he was very loth to answer, but at last he admitted he had. He was then asked if those two Accounts were the same. Then again he boggl'd, but at last said he believed they corroborated; and being called upon to explain himself, he still talked of their corroborating; nor could any other Answer be got from him. He was then asked what *Canning* had sworn before the sitting Alderman, but "he had forgot; he could not keep such Things in his Head so long." But, Sir, then how came you to keep what passed between *Canning* and you in your Head so long? "I don't know;" if you had forgot what she said before the Alderman, how came you to swear it was the same with what she said in Court? "I believe it corroborated." Was it not directly contrary to what she swore in Court? "I can't tell; it is a great while ago." Did she not swear before the Alderman she lay on the bare Boards? "I don't know." Did she not swear she left some Water in the Pitcher behind her? "I can't tell." Did she not swear she had four, five, or six Crusts of Bread to live upon? "I don't remember." Did she not describe Pictures over the Chimney? "I have forgot." Did she not describe an old Table and an old Stool or two? "I don't know." Did she describe the Nest of Drawers, the Hay, the

Saddles, or in short any one Particular that was in the Room ? “ Yes ; she mentioned the Bed gown and the broken Pitcher.” Any Thing else ? “ I don’t recollect.” Did she not swear she got out of the Window upon a Shed or Pent-house of Boards ; that she slid down to the Edge of it, and jumped from thence upon a Bank ? “ Really I don’t remember.” Is there any Shed or Pent-house under any of the Windows of the Work-shop ? “ I believe not.” But to have done with Mr. S——.

Next came his good Friend A——n, who swore he went with the rest to *Wells’s*, and was one of the first Persons who went into the Workshop ; that he found the Hay lay loose, as if it had been lately tossed up ; that he found the Window at the End boarded quite cross, and that so close, that there did not appear to be any Cracks through which the *Hertford* Coachman could be seen ; but said, as the Boards did not reach quite to the Top of the Window, it was possible to look over them by climbing up : He said, he and *Canning’s* Uncle pulled down the Boards before *Canning* came in ; that he observed before he pulled them down, that they seemed to have been very lately nailed up, for where the Nails were drove, the Wood seemed to be fresh split ; he said when *Canning* came down, he conducted her into the House, and that upon her seeing the great Stairs leading into the House, which front the
Street-

Street-door, and take up the whole Space between the Parlour and Kitchen-walls, she the Moment she set her Foot in the House, and before she saw the Kitchen, or any other Room, said, she believed she was carried up those Stairs. He acknowledged that when she was set in the Kitchen, the Work-shop Door was wide open, and yet that *Canning* shewed no Sign of knowing it: But he said he believed *Virtue Hall* stood between her and the Door at that Time. He said when *Canning* had pitched upon the Work-shop as the Place of her Confinement, he set himself between her and the little Window, and asked her what might be seen from thence? and that she answered, Trees, an Hill at a Distance, and some Houses towards the left Hand; and he believes at that Time she could not see out of that Window; but he owned he stood about a Yard and a half from the Window, and that she had been five or six Minutes in the Room, and might have looked out of the Window, before he thought of making the Experiment: He admitted, the great Stair-case, and the Steps into the Work-shop were so very unlike, that he was greatly struck with *Canning's* mistaking the one for the other, and thought it so surprising, that he told her to be very careful what she said, for, says he, you see, Child, you are mistaken in the Stair-case.

Some other Witnesses were called to prove *Canning's* being so long absent, her Return, her Illness, her going down to *Enfield Wash*, and what happened there ; but no Part of their Evidence was very material, except that of the Apothecary and Physician who attended her. The first of whom proved, that she was very low, faint and emaciated ; that she complained of her Bowels ; that he administered Glisters to her, because nothing passed through her ; that those Glisters had little or no Effect till the 5th of *February*, when she had a Stool. The Physician also proved, that when he visited her she appeared very ill, and it seemed to him that her Illness was occasioned by long fasting, Cold and Hardships ; but he did not see any Thing particularly black in her Face and Hands ; and both he and the Apothecary owned, that it was very possible all the Symptoms they observed in *Canning* might arise from a Fever, or many other Causes. The Physician said when he saw her she had an Inflammation like *St. Anthony's Fire* upon one Ear, and all one Side of her Face, which he apprehended arose from some Hurt, inflamed by her bad Habit of Body.

The Defendant's Council then called a Man, to prove he saw her carried through the Turnpike at *Stamford-hill*, by two Men ;

Men; but his Evidence was quite wide of their Mark; for in the first Place he could not fix the Day of the Month by any Means: Nay, it appeared highly probable from some Circumstances, that it was not on the first of *January*; in the next Place the Hour of the Night did not correspond with *Canning's* Story, for she was robbed between nine and ten in *Moorfields*; now he saw the Woman carried by the Turnpike between ten and eleven; and these two Places being about four Miles and a half asunder, it is impossible that *Canning* should be carried so far in the Time. 3^{dly}. He did not see the Woman's Face. 4^{thly}. The Woman he saw cry'd and sobbed very much, and walked along upright upon her Legs, and very fast; but *Canning* was in a Fit all the Time, and Nobody ever saw a Person in a Fit set one Foot before another. 5^{thly}. The Woman he saw had a light-coloured Gown and an Apron on, whereas *Canning's* Gown was Purple, but being stripp'd of that and her Apron in *Moorfields*, she remained in her Stays and a black Petticoat. 6^{thly}. The Men he saw had no Great Coats on.

After this, three Witnesses were brought to prove that she was seen returning to *London* on the 29th of *January*, dressed in the Manner she had sworn.

The

The first of these Witnesses swore he was coming towards *London*, a little on this Side Mrs. *Wells's*, and about two hundred Yards below the Tanner's House, at a Gate, he met a young Woman dressed in a short Kind of old Thing over her Shoulders; that she had no Stays on, and folded her Arms before her; and he believes it was *Canning*, but cannot swear to her; that it was about four in the Evening; that she asked the Way to *London*, and told him she had been frightened by the Tanner's Dog; that he bade her turn on the left Hand and then on the right. N. B. This Evidence gave his Testimony in so confused and uncertain a Manner, that it was very difficult to understand him clearly, and therefore there may very probably be some Mistakes made in relating what he said. This only is certain, that the Woman he saw (if he saw one at all) could not be *Canning*; for she swears she went down the Lane, and over the Fields, at the Back of Mrs. *Wells's* House; and S—— swears she told him of the Foot of the Bridge by the Tanner's. She also swears that the Foot-path led her by the Road-side, and that she came straight to *London*, without any Mention of being frightened by the Tanner's Dog: But the Place where this Witness pretended to have seen her, is two or three hundred Yards further

ther from *London* than the Bridge where she must have first come into the *London Road*.

The next Witness lives at *Enfield Wash*, and saw a poor miserable Object, dressed pretty nearly as the other Witness had described, and who looked as if she was *welly* famished, pass by his Door. He asked her if she wanted an Husband, to which she made no Answer: But his young Lady had a very white Hand, was very pale, had not much Colour in her Cheeks, but looked whitish: Then he said she looked very white. Now Mrs. *Canning's* Apprentice had unfortunately proved, that *Elizabeth Canning* was as black as an Hat.

The third Witness to this Point is a Mantua-maker, who lived near *Edmonton Church*, she set out about three o'Clock of the 29th of *January*, to go about a short Mile towards *London*, which Space she used commonly to walk in about a Quarter of an Hour. The Person she went to not being at home, she returned back immediately, and in her Return met a poor wretched Girl at a Stile in one of the *Duckfields*, about a Quarter of a Mile from her own House. She described the Girl's Dress very minutely, and was astonishingly particular as to the Bed-gown, which she said appeared to be an old Linen with faded red Flowers; That it seemed to have been quilted; that it was

3

much

much worn, and the Wool came through it in many Places : She was asked if *Elizabeth Canning*, who stood at the Bar, was the same young Woman ; to which she answered, she verily believed she was, for that she thought she knew her again by *the Tip of her Nose*. She also swore she had never seen her from that Day to the Time of her being examined in Court. Being asked what Appearance the Girl made, she said she looked very dirty and nasty, but said nothing of any Blackness in her Face or Hands.

As she had sworn, first, that she met the Woman about Dusk, and afterwards that she set out from home at three, and only went a Quarter of an Hour's Walk towards *London*, and Part of that Way back again, without stopping before she met her ; (which two Accounts were not only contradictory to each other ; but both of them incompatible with *Canning's* Tale, who did not get out of *Mrs. Wells's* till after four o'Clock, and *Wells's* is near four Miles from the Place this Woman speaks of, which Place *Canning* could not possibly have reached much before six o' Clock, as she swears she was six Hours in going eleven Miles ; and the three last Witnesses also swore the Woman they saw walked very slow) ; this Witness was particularly examined as to the Time of the Night ; and throughout her
Ex-

Examination persisted in saying she set out at Three, and that she stay'd no where before she went Home ; but said, as she was a Woman in publick Business, she might very likely meet Acquaintance on the Road, who might stop and talk with her ; she could not indeed say she had met with any, but probably she had ; she was asked how long she might be stopped by People talking to her in that Manner ; she said, perhaps, a Quarter of an Hour in the whole. And this was all the Account she could give of the Time she had spent from Three of the Clock till she met the young Woman, which, according to her own Story, must have been at least a Quarter of an Hour before Four o'Clock, and yet she afterwards took upon her to swear it was about Five o'Clock when she met the Woman, for that when she went out she left Word at Home that she should be back in two Hours, and when she came Home she found she had exceeded her Time by a Quarter of an Hour ; in which are observable two glaring Absurdities ; first, as she thereby contradicted all she had said before with Regard to Time ; and, secondly, because the 29th of *January*, 1753, happening to be a cloudy Evening, and there being no Moon at Five of the Clock (which yet was an Hour before *Canning* could possibly be there) it must have been so dark, that, instead of minutely describing her Bed-

F

gown

gown and the Tip of her Nose, she could hardly have seen her clearly enough to distinguish even whether she was an human Creature or not.

The next Evidence offered by the Defendant's Council was the Testimony of about twenty Persons, to prove that all the Witnesses examined on the Behalf of the Prosecution to shew that the Gypsey was at *Abbotsbury* at the Time *Canning* pretended to have been robbed by her, were perjured, and that *Mary Squires* the Gypsey (notwithstanding the Oaths of 40 Persons to the contrary, all of them of fair Characters, and who could not be mistaken either as to Time, or as to the Woman) was really at, and in the Neighbourhood of *Enfield-Wash*, from the Beginning of *December* to the first of *February* when she was taken up.

As the Witnesses to this Point were so very numerous, let it suffice, that the most material Circumstances in their Evidence shall be touched upon; that the Nature of their Testimony in general shall be explained; that nothing of Weight, sworn in Favour of the Girl, shall be wilfully suppressed or misrepresented, nor any thing, which makes against her, falsely related, or exaggerated.

Mr. S—, of *Waltham-Abbey*, swore, that, on the 14th of *December* 1752, he saw *Mary Squires* and one of her Daughters coming out of Mrs. *Wells's* House; he went
up

up to the Door, and spoke to the Old Woman, and swears positively to her. The Daughter indeed he cannot swear to, because she stood with her Back partly towards him. But he has seen the old Woman a Year or two before upon *Enfield Chase* with her Family. They used then to wear Blankets, Gypsey-fashion, and had two or three Asses with them.

A Farmer, near *Enfield-Chase*, swears, that, in the Month of *December*, the Gypsey lay in his Cow-house two Nights and three Days; that she then had with her two Sons and two Daughters; he was positive to the old Woman, but though the Son and the two Daughters of the Gypsey were all shewn to him in Court, he did not pretend to swear to any of them. He also swore that he had seen the Gypsey several Times before for many Years.

[This Chap swore, that he was examined on the Trial of *Mary Squires* when she was convicted at the *Old-Bailey*, and that he then gave Evidence in that Court of her being the same Woman who lay in his Cow-house; but, upon looking into that Trial, it appeared that he was not examined at all in Court, nor had he ever given Evidence before the Grand Jury upon that Occasion, and yet he stuck to it stiffly for a good while, but at last thought fit to forget what Time of the Year he was examined, and

even whether the *Old-Bailey*, in which he then stood, was the same Place where he was examined before or not.]

Another Witness, whose House adjoins to the Farmer's Cow-house, also swears to the old Gypsey, and that she lay there at the Time the Farmer had sworn to, but neither does he swear to any of her Children, and, what is still more extraordinary, he not only swears to her having her own Sons and Daughters with her, but also two little Children with her, and being asked as to their Ages, said, some of them (that is, of the two) might be about four or five Years old, and some of them about six or seven.

Another of *Canning's* Evidence swears to the following most extraordinary Circumstance, *viz.* the Gypsey had lost a little brown or black Horse (for the Colour of him is not well settled) and desired the Witness to let her know if he happened to see him, and at the same Time told him that her Horse's Legs were tied together, and that he had a Clog on which was marked with the Words *Mary Squires*, which she told him was her Name.

The last Witness's Wife also swore to seeing the Gypsey at the same Time, and that she asked her after her Horse. This Witness also saw her Son upon the Chace whistling for the Horse, but neither can she swear to the Faces of the Son, or either of the Daughters.

Mr.

Mr. —, at *Enfield-Wash*, and who deservedly bears a very fair Character, swore he saw the Gypsey pass by him on the fifth of *January* as he was filling a Wheel-barrow of Gravel before his own Door; he had also seen her several other Times, but cannot fix on any other Day, except that one, and that Day he is very positive to, because, being old *Christmas-Day*, he had given his Servant a Holiday to go to *London* on his own Affairs; but then he own'd he had never spoke to the old Woman in all his Life, and that, when she passed by him that Day, she did not come within several Yards of him, so that he might easily mistake the Side-Face of an old Woman, who constantly goes with three Parts of it covered up on Account of the King's-Evil, and even as to Time he may err. In the first Place, he was not called upon to recollect the Time till some Months afterwards, and though there is not the least Reason in the World to doubt, but that he gave his Servant a Holiday on old *Christmas-Day*, and that when his Servant was absent, he did fill Gravel into a Wheelbarrow, and saw some old Gypsey whilst he was so doing, yet it is by no Means clear, that his Servant was never absent during the whole Month of *January* except that Day, nor that he never filled Gravel in the Absence of his Servant but once; and even if he had never done so but once, that once might happen during

any other Absence of his Servant, it might be the 25th instead of the 5th, and Mr. —, without any Impeachment upon his Credit, might be very pardonable in mistaking whether it was done during one Absence of his Servant or another.

One Witness was called for two Purposes, the first was to prove his picking up a Piece of Lead with Blood upon it under the Window *Canning* said she escaped out of; and the other was to prove his seeing the Gypsey on the 9th of *January*. The finding the Lead he swore to, and that he carried it directly Home to his Mother as a Curiosity; but that he never shewed this Lead to any of the People who went down to take up the Gypsey, though he found it at the same Time that they were there, nor did he ever say a Word of it to any Body. The Lead was not produced in Court, for the Mother being called to confirm her Son's Evidence as to this Matter, said, he did not give it to her till some Days after the first of *February* (though he swore he carried it to her directly) and said she had wrapt it in a Piece of Paper, and laid it in a Drawer; but on looking for it lately, she found the Paper, but the Lead was gone.

The Son also swore to seeing the Gypsey the 9th of *January*, and ascertained the Time by the Space between it and *Christmas-Day*, but being asked when *Christmas-Day* was? he could not tell, nor even whether it was before

or

or after *New-Year's-Day* ; he said he lived at _____, but could not tell what County it was in, nor who was Landlord of it ; nay, he had sworn, that having been out at Service, of some Kind or other (for there was no learning of what Kind) he came Home to his Father's in Autumn before the Gypsey was taken up, and yet he could not tell where he had lived till that Time. In short, he betrayed such gross and stupid Ignorance on the one Hand, and such a Readiness to assert on the other, as almost exceeds Belief ; but let it be remarked here once for all, that he was not the only Person amongst *Canning's* Witnesses who made Use of *Christmas-Day* to fix the Time of seeing the Gypsey, and yet could not tell when *Christmas-Day* was, nor even whether it was not on *Good-Friday* or *Holy-Thursday* ; nay, one Person swore it was the 25th of *February*, and another that it was in *June* or *July*.

One Woman swore to seeing the Gypsey on a certain Day in *January*, and on being asked how she could be particular as to the Day, said, because the *Monday* was a Month before, she had killed a Pig.

One Woman swore to seeing the Gypsey at a particular Time, which she was vastly sure of, because she knew the Day of the Week, and had looked in her Almanack, to see what Day of the Month that was ; but having an Almanack shewn to her, and a Day
of

of the Month of *December* pointed out, and she being desired to tell what Day of the Week that Day happened upon, after puzzling a long Time, she confessed she did not know, but endeavoured to excuse herself by saying, that that Almanack was not the same with hers, which was a Sheet Almanack, tho' unluckily it was in reality no more than a Sheet Almanack cut into Leaves, and bound: Nay, her own Council hoping to set her right, pointed to the Month of *September*, and asked which was the first *Sunday* in that Month; this made her puzzle again for a good while, and at last she pitched upon the seventh Day of the Month, which happened to be *Tuesday*; and when the whole Court fell a laughing at her Ignorance, she most cunningly cried out, "Why, is not *Sunday* the seventh Day?"

A Servant Maid swore to seeing the Gypsey on the 20th or 21st, because she was making minc'd Pyes that Day, to be ready against her young Master's Birth-Day, which was the 29th; and also swore to her Daughter *Mary's* coming to her Master, Mr. ———'s Well, to fetch Water, and that she came with a large black Pitcher.

This Girl's Mistress saw the Gypsey at Mrs. *Wells's* House with her Daughter, as she the Witness was standing at her own Door, which is not above fifty or sixty Yards off; but Mrs. ——— chances to be short-sighted,

ed, so could not swear to the Gypsey, but did to one of the Daughters who came to fetch Water at her Well: However, the Time she swore to, was not above one or two Days before that, on which it is admitted on all Hands, that the Gypsey was really at *Enfield Wash*.

A Boy, Servant to a Farmer just by Mrs. *Wells's*, proved his seeing the Gypsey about the Middle of *January*; but on his cross Examination said, that he used to water his Master's Horses every Morning and Evening in *January*, at the Pond, which is directly under the very Window, out of which *Canning* pretended to have seen the *Hertford* Coach; that the Weather was cold, and the Pond froze over during that Month; and he was forced to break the Ice on one Side, in order to water his Horses; and that he used to slide, and saw several Boys sliding upon the other Side of the Pond almost every Day, for several Days together.

A Woman was examined, and swore, that she saw the Gypsey on the 18th of *January*; and was certain as to the Time, because it was two Days after she carried some Work home to Mr. *Smitham*, which was on the 16th; being asked how she knew it was the 16th when she carried her Work home, she said she was positive it was, because he set it down in his Book: She owned indeed she could not read, but still she adhered to the

G

Day;

Day; whereupon Mr. *Smitham* and his Daughter were examined, and the Book in question produced; from whence it manifestly appeared, that the old Woman did not carry her Work home till the 23d, and consequently did not see the Gypsey till the 25th.

Several of the Witnesses were also produced, who referred themselves to Notes, and other written Evidences, to fix the Time of their seeing the Gypsey. But it was thought very extraordinary, that not one Note or Paper was produced in Confirmation of what they said. It is also worthy of Observation, that very few of the Defendant's Witnesses pretended to have ever spoken to the Gypsey, and that no two of them were in Company together at any of the Times they saw her, though one would be apt to imagine, that she must, in the long Series of seven or eight Weeks, have been seen by many Persons at a Time, the rather as some of the Witnesses say, they saw her in Ale-Houses, and other Places of general Resort, and as from the many different Days on which they swear to her, it is most manifest, that she was (if really at *Enfield Wash*) passing and repassing publick and visible every Day almost for a Month.

The Defendants also examined some Witnesses to prove, that Messieurs *Nash* and *Aldridge*, two of the Persons who went in the Coach to *Enfield Wash* on the first of *February*,

ary, and who, on Sight of the Room, gave up the Girl's Cause immediately, as they swore upon the Trial, were not really convinced of her being an Impostor (whatever they might say) by what they then saw, for that *Nash* afterwards wrote a Letter to Mr. *Lyon* in her Behalf, and gave Money to the Subscription set on Foot for her; and that *Aldridge* solicited Subscriptions, and distributed Papers in her Behalf. Whether these Facts are true or false, is of very small Moment, as the Truth or Falshood of the Girl's Story depends upon its own Basis, and the positive Evidence given in Court, and not by any Means upon what *Aldridge* or *Nash* thought of it. This only therefore need be said, that as to *Nash*, the Money he gave, and which is alluded to in the Letter sent to *Lyon*, was only about Half a Crown, which was then in Mr. *Lyon*'s Hands, being the Ballance in *Nash*'s Favour of a common Purse, which he, *Lyon*, *Hague* and *Aldridge*, had put together in the Morning of their Expedition, to pay the Expences of the Day; and as *Lyon* had long been *Nash*'s Friend and Customer, he might reasonably suppose, that if he called for that Money out of his Hands, it might widen the Breach already made between them by their Difference in Opinion, and might hope by giving it up for the Advantage of the Girl, to regain Mr. *Lyon*'s Good-will. However, it is

remarkable, that even in that Letter there is not the least Hint, that he believed *Canning's* Story, or that he gave the Money to assist in the Prosecution then carrying on. As to *Aldridge*, he was desired by an Acquaintance in *Aldermanbury*, to carry down one of *Canning's* printed Cases to Mr. *Howard*, who was also an Acquaintance of his, and lives at *Enfield Wash*, who on receiving it, desired him to bring him another, which he did the next Time he went that Way. What passed between him and *Howard* on those Occasions, is far from being clear. *Howard* says, he expressed his Belief of the Girl's Story, and recommended it to him to raise Subscriptions for her. This *Aldridge* denies, and truly the Probability seems to be on his Side, for it is not at all likely that Mr. *Lyon* should quarrel with him on the first of *February*, in the Coach, as they were coming home, and that to such a Degree, upon the Girl's Account, as never to speak to him, *Hague*, or *Aldridge* since, unless he had been fully convinced by their Declarations, That they were all perfectly satisfied of the Girl's Imposture.

The Defendants afterwards endeavoured to prove, that Mrs. *Wells* confessed the having confined *Elizabeth Canning* in her House, and for that Purpose called two Witnesses.

One of them says, that on seeing Mrs. *Wells's*

Wells's Name in the News-papers, he having formerly been acquainted with her, went to see her in *Clerkenwell Bridewell*, soon after she was taken up, and carried a Friend with him; he said upon seeing her, he told her he had read her Name in the News-papers, and asked her how she could be so barbarous to keep the Girl there for a Fortnight. To which *Wells* answered, she was there twenty-eight Days. This Witness says he asked her no further Questions about the Affair, nor any Explanation of what she had said.

The other Witness was the Person who went with him, and gave a kind of general Confirmation of what his Friend had before sworn, only he happened to deny that there was a Word said about News-papers, which the other had positively asserted. And after all, the Evidence of these two People amounted to nothing at all; for the whole Truth of the Business is no more than that one of them mistaking the Time the Girl was said in the News-paper to be confined, and calling it a Fortnight, Mrs. *Wells* set him right, and told him it was twenty-eight Days; that is, the News-paper said she was confined twenty-eight Days; not that she ever intended to say any such Thing for Truth, or to confess or deny one Word of the Matter.

Another Person was also called: He went to see *Mary Squires* in *Clerkenwell, Bridewell*, and upon talking the Matter over with her, she said, "As God is my Saviour, I am
as

as innocent of cutting off the Girl's Stays, as the Child unborn." This Witness also swore, that *Squires* said she had been at Mother *Wells's* about a Fortnight and three Days, and believed the Girl was there. This Witness afterwards swore, that *Squires* acknowledged absolutely, that the Girl was there. Then that she said, "That she was there to be sure." Then, "Sure enough, I believe the Girl was there." But he was not quite right, yet it seems, and so rubbed out what he had sworn before, and instead of it, said the Gypsey told him, "She was positive, and almost sure of it." And the Jest of it is, that it was not a long Conversation, nor several different Declarations of the Gypsey, but only one poor mouthful of Words, which this honest Man tortured at such a barbarous Rate. Another Thing deserves Attention, which is, that this Man never told any body that the Gypsey had said any such Thing, till within this three Months, and after all, what did the whole amount to? Why, the Gypsey declared she was innocent; and hearing the general Outcry against Mother *Wells*, had an Opinion bad enough of her to believe she was guilty, and either *Squires* or the Witness (but if one may guess by the Sample, he is most likely to blunder) mistook as to the Length of Time she had been at *Wells's*, though if *Squires* really said a Fortnight and three Days, she most probably computed backwards from the Time the Man was talking to her, and not from the first of *February*, when she was taken up.

The

The Defendant also called two Witnesses to prove, that about a Fortnight before *Canning* was tried, *Judith Natus* being asked how she and her Husband could be so wicked as to swear against the Girl, when they must know that she was at Mrs. *Wells's*, confessed that she was there, and accordingly one of them swore, that, upon that Occasion, *Judith Natus* said, "Indeed I can't but say she was there;" but the other Witness said the Words were, "Indeed I can't say she was not there," so that they vary materially in the Words, one leaving out the Word (but), and clapping in (not); the other other putting in (but), and leaving out (not). Now what if after all the Words she really spoke were, "Indeed I can't say she was there—there is nothing very improbable in the Supposition. But if this Solution of the Difficulty does not satisfy the Reader, let him take another, and the true one, for the above is only given to shew how little Stress is to be laid upon Witnesses in general, who come so well inclined to serve a Cause, as to aim at it by picking up Tags and Ends of Conversations, and then vary from one another in the Relation of what they have heard. The Truth of the Matter is, that *Judith Natus* did really say, that *Elizabeth Canning* was at Mother *Wells's* House, and if the ingenious Witnesses had had Wit enough to ask her when, she would certainly have told them, "On the first of *February* when she was carried down. *Judith Natus* found they were trying to pump her,
and

and therefore, artfully enough in her Way, gave them an equivocal Answer to an impertinent Question, and thereby drew the poor Souls in to make themselves a little ridiculous by their Testimony.

A Witness was called to contradict what *Whiffin* had deposed, as to his fetching the Sign Irons out of the Workshop on the 18th of *January*, and he accordingly swore, that he carried a Sign Home to *Whiffin's* on the 19th, and then advised him to buy the Irons of Mrs. *Wells*, and that eight or ten Days afterwards *Whiffin* told him he had not got them yet, but that he would go and buy them. But, as to this Man's Testimony, nothing more need be said, than that he produced a Memorandum-Book, wherein was an Entry of the carrying Home the Sign on the 8th of *January*. But then he confessed that he kept his Books by the old Stile, and consequently that eighth Day was the 19th; and being asked how he came to date by the old Stile? Why, he said, he was no great Scholar, and so truly he reckoned the Stile by his Clock.

Two Witnesses were called to impeach *Fortune Natus's* Character, and if one of them drove the Nail, really the other clenched it, for he swore that he believed *Natus* to be so sad a Dog, and so naturally inclined to Lying and Perjury, that he would readily forswear himself in a Court of Justice for a Shilling; nay, further, that if he did not get a Shilling for swearing falsely, he believed he would perjure himself in Hopes of one.

After

After such a Character as this of poor *Natus*, (a Character, by the bye, which the wickedest of all the Beings in the Universe, the Devil himself excepted, can scarcely merit) the Reader will be, doubtless, very much surpriz'd to hear that the Council for the Prosecution should attempt to wipe off so foul an Imputation; but so it is.

They called the Master of the *Four Swans* at *Waltham-Cross*, who deposed, that he took *Natus* into his Service about fifteen Months ago at Six-pence *per* Day; that he had employed him ever since, and liked his Behaviour so well that he raised his Wages from Six-pence *per* Day to Seven Shillings *per* Week; he said, he believed him to be as honest and industrious a Fellow as lives in the whole World, and that he did not believe he would do an ill Thing on any Occasion; that, in the whole Time he lived with him he never caught him in a Lye, nor ever knew him to neglect any Business he was ordered to do; he further said, he had eight Servants, and only wished he had one amongst them equal to *Natus*. He added, that he would have taken him into his House with all his Heart long ago but for *Judith* his Wife, who is given to Liquor, and, in those Circumstances, apt to behave ill, and be troublesome.

Several other Witnesses attended to prove *Natus's* good Character, but it was judged unnecessary to call them.

The Council for the Prosecution also called six or seven Witnesses in Support of *Whiffin's*

H

Character;

Character; after two of them had been examined, the Defendant's Council admitted that he bore a good one, and thereby saved the Court the Trouble of hearing any more.

The Council, after this, made a Reply which lasted about three Hours and an half, and the Recorder then summed up Part of the Evidence; but being tired out with the extreme Length of it, Mr. Baron *Legge* took his Notes, and went quite through with them. The Jury, in about two Hours, brought in, that the Defendant was guilty of Perjury, but not wilful and corrupt; but being told by the Court that that was no Verdict, they went out again, and in about half an Hour returned, (as we have all heard) brought her in guilty, and recommended her to Mercy.

It is now full Time to make such Observations upon the Testimony offered to the Court on both Sides, as may serve to clear up an Affair, hitherto thought extremely perplexed and dark, merely for want of having the Facts on both Sides fairly laid before the Public, candidly explained, and perfectly understood.

In order to do this, the Reader is desired to reflect, that *Canning* was indicted for falsely swearing, knowingly, willfully, and corruptly upon the Trial of *Mary Squires*, " That she
 " was robbed in *Moorfields* by two Men;
 " knocked down by them there, and after-
 " wards carried down to *Endfield-Wash* to the
 " House of Mrs. *Wells*; that she was there
 " robbed of her Stays by the Gypsey, and
 " pushed

“ pushed up into a Room in that House, where
 “ she was confined for twenty-eight Days with-
 “ out seeing one Creature, and without having
 “ any Thing to eat or drink, except a small
 “ Quantity of Bread and Water, and that she
 “ made her Escape by pulling down some
 “ Boards, nailed on the Inside of a Window, and
 “ jumping out of it about eight or ten Feet;” and
 that there were also many other Assignments of
 Perjury in the Indictment. The Falsity of many
 of which, are in their own Nature incapable of
 Proof; such for Instance, as her swearing that
 she was robbed by two Men in *Moorfields*, that
 she was knocked down, that she fell in a Fir,
 which lasted for several Hours, that she came
 to herself in an open Road where there was
 Water, and many others; the Falsehood of
 which (if false) being totally hid within her
 own Breast, can never be proved by any other
 Person.

What then was necessary under this Indict-
 ment to convict her?

It could by no Means be necessary to prove,
 that every Word she swore upon the Trial was
 false: But it was absolutely incumbent upon the
 Prosecutor to shew, that some Part of what she
 then swore, not only was false, but that at the
 Time she swore, she well knew it was so, and
 willfully swore it. The Word Corruption is
 necessary in all Indictments for Perjury; but no
 other Proof of that Corruption is, or in the Na-
 ture of Things can be expected, than that the
 Person swearing, knew at the Time he swore,

that what he said, or Part of what he said on Oath was false. The Law implies all the rest, for it is not given to Man to pry into the human Heart; and therefore we can only judge of the Intention by the Act; and surely if one Person indicts another of any Crime, whereof he is not Guilty, and upon that Indictment willfully for-swears himself in such a Manner, as that if his Oath gains Credit, the Person accused must be convicted and suffer the Penalties of the Law. No Man living can doubt, but that the Accuser swore corruptly, that is, with a wicked Intent; for the Laws of the Kingdom are not nonsensical enough, by the Word Corrupt, to mean that the Person swearing was hired or bribed by any body else to perjure himself; since surely there is equal Corruption, equal Guilt, in perjuring one self from the Dictates of one's own Heart, or from the Bribes or Instigations of another.

Therefore in the Case before us, it is totally immaterial, whether *Canning*, at the Time she swore at the *Old-Bailly*, had any particular personal Malice against *Mary Squires*, or not; the single Question is, whether she did or did not know at that Time, that what she said was false; if she knew it was, she most certainly intended that *Mary Squires* should be convicted and hanged unjustly; and it was of very little Consequence to the poor old Woman, whether she should be brought to the Gallows by a false Oath, sworn out of Animosity against her, or by one taken to save a Reputation, to cheat the Publick

Publick by Subscriptions, or for any other base End. This is certain, that if *Canning* wilfully for-swore herself, without having any Malice against the Gypsey, that Circumstance is so far from being an Extenuation of her Guilt, that it will justify the severest Judgment against one, who by swearing away the Life of an innocent Woman without Provocation and without Resentment, has most clearly shewn, that she is capable of committing a Murder with the Sword of Justice; and makes no Scruple to sacrifice any of her fellow Creatures, whenever she may think it convenient to screen her own Conduct, or to answer her own bad Purposes.

Let us now proceed to examine how far the Evidence given against her, tends to shew her having sworn falsely, and how far it tends to shew, she knew at the very Time she swore that she was guilty of Perjury.

And first, it was most manifestly proved, that the Gypsey was not guilty of robbing her; for such a regular consistent Chain of Evidence, perhaps was never before given in a Court of Justice, to shew, that *Squires* was at *Abbotsbury*, at the very Time *Canning* pretended she was robbed by her at *Endfield-Wash*.—The vast Number of Witnesses, and their moral Characters, not to add, their Situation in the World, the Poverty of the Gypsey, and the Rank and Character of the Magistrate who has espoused that Cause, which he believed a just one, without any other Motives than Justice and Humanity, or the Hopes of any other Reward, than Calumny,

Calumny, Abuse, and Insults, remove the Possibility of a Suspicion, that those Witnesses were suborned.

The Remoteness of their Habitations, and their Ignorance of each other, make it equally impossible, that they should have concerted a false Evidence to save a Woman, whose Poverty set it out of her Power to make them any Returns.

The amazing Congruity of their Evidence, was beyond the Art of Man to have concerted, and if not true, could never have happened; their personal Acquaintance with the Gypsey (some of them for many Years) many of them from her having lodged in their Houses; and all of them from having conversed with her, put it out of Doubt, that they do not mistake the Person, especially when we consider, that they do not swear to the old Woman alone, but to two other Persons (her Son and Daughter *Lucy*) also, both of whom travelled with her at that Time; and both of whom the Witnesses knew, as perfectly as they do *Squires* herself.

The Days on which the Gypsey was seen amongst them, they cannot be mistaken in; for they are proved to a Demonstration, by the Books of the Excise-Office, and many other Evidences, which could not be forged or altered, and which cannot be mistaken or misconstrued.

Thus *Canning's* Oath, That she was robbed by *Mary Squires*, most palpably was false; but God forbid that she should be convicted on the fullest

fullest Evidence of the Gypsey's Innocence— She may be mistaken, and if the other Parts of her Story are true, she ought not to be punished for mistaking. It is strange indeed that she should fix upon so very remarkable a Woman as *Mary Squires* instead of any other Person in the World, as, in all Probability, the whole World cannot produce her Likeness; but then *Canning* was just recovered from a Fit of six Hours, was greatly fatigued, never saw the Gypsey but that once, and in the Night, and only for a few Minutes, and that at a Time too when she expected every Moment to be murdered by her— she might not, in such dreadful Circumstances, take very particular Notice of the old Woman's Face; and yet if she did not, why should she swear so positively to her afterwards? that certainly could not be right; however, whilst there remains a Possibility of her Innocence, she should not be condemned.

But the next Head of Evidence too clearly proves the Guilt as well as Falsehood of the Defendant's Oath. The Reader will see I mean that Part of the Case which rests upon her Ignorance of the Room till the first of *February*, when she went down to see it; her describing it in a Manner so widely different from the Truth, that, on Examination, it appears to resemble the Account she gave of it in scarce any one Particular, except that it really had a Top, Sides, and Bottom; her contradicting herself upon Oath in many Particulars which she could not be mistaken in; her swearing to many Things

Things as being in the Room, which neither were nor could have been there; and her not swearing to Things which really were there, and which she could not have forgot if she had ever seen them: For Instance,

She could not mistake a Room above thirty-five Feet long and not ten Feet wide for a little square Room.

She could not swear, by Mistake, that she got out upon a Penthouse of Boards, when in Fact there is no such Penthouse, especially as upon the Trial she contradicted what she had sworn and deposed, that she jumped down directly.

She could not swear, by Mistake, that there was a Grate in the Chimney, because she says she took the Bed-gown out of it, and yet it is most certain that there was no such Grate.

She could not swear, by Mistake, that there were a few Pictures over the Chimney, and yet there never were any.

She could not swear, by Mistake, that there was nothing else in the Room except an old Table and an old Stool or two, when had she been there she must have seen the Hay, a large Nest of Drawers, and the other Particulars before enumerated.

She could not have sworn as she did before the Alderman, that she was carried through *Bishopsgate-Street*, if what she swore in Court was true, that she fell into a Fit in *Moorfields*, and continued in it till she reached *Enfield-Wash*.

She could not swear at one Time, that she left some of the Water behind her; at another, that she drank it all up three Days before she escaped, and at a third, that she drank the last Part of it about Half an Hour before she got out, *by Mistake*; for it is impossible she should forget, whether she was three Days without Water or not.

If in these Instances, and many more of the same Kind, *Canning* could not be mistaken; she must be wilfully and corruptly guilty of Perjury; and that the Facts alledged against her in this Respect were strictly true, has been proved by Persons of unquestionable Veracity, and in no Respect denied or attempted to be denied, or even to be explained away.

The last most fatal and uncontradicted Head of Evidence, is, that of the several Persons who were in, or saw other Persons in the very Room, and at the very Time that *Canning* pretended she was confined there. The Reader need not be reminded of their Evidence; if he has attended at all, he cannot have over-looked so striking a Part of the Case: Let it only be observed, that several of those Witnesses bear very fair Characters; that the Testimony of every one of them was not only circumstantial, clear, and consistent with itself, but also, that the Evidence of them all, was confirmed by the mutual Harmony, and exact Correspondence of their several Testimonies.

Let it be added, that if what the Witnesses to this last Fact have proved be true (and they are most of them under no Temptation to for-swear themselves, neither has what they

swore been denied, or any Evidence whatsoever been produced in answer to it) *Canning* must remain without Defence, without Excuse, and without any one Circumstance to palliate her Crimes.

She might mistake the Gypsey, she might possibly (tho' that is hardly possible) mistake her Daughter too, for she swore to both the Mother and Daughter. Let us admit (if any Body should be weak enough to ask for such a Concession) that she might even mistake the *Hertfordshire* Road, the Front of Mrs. *Wells's* House, and even her Kitchen—for some other Gypsey, some other Daughter, some other Road, House, and Kitchen.—But she could not mistake a Room she had been in for twenty-eight Days together, with all the Lumber it contained (such an one as the Work-shop in question, especially a Place so remarkable, that one more easy to be remembred was never built nor seen by Man) for any other Room in the Universe.—Nay, could she possibly mistake the Window she said she got out off, the Pond under that Window, which she said she remembred; the Lane she said she went down, the Fields she pretended to have crossed, the Foot-Bridge by the Tanner's House—for some other Window, some other Pond, some other Lane, Fields, and Bridge?—She could not; Reason cries out, impossible!—And he who can believe it may receive the *Fairy Tales* for Gospel.—Nor far short in Faith from such a Man, is he who can believe, that all the last-mentioned Witnesses swore falsely, and that *Canning* was confined a Month in a Room,
that

that had one at least, if not two unfastened Windows in it; and the Plaister-Walls of which are in such a Condition, that she might have made twenty Holes in it, each large enough to get out at, in a Couple of Hours with her Fingers.

Thus therefore stood the Case upon closing the Evidence for the Crown; there had been indisputable Proof given of what *Canning* swore upon the Trial of *Mary Squires*.—A vast Number of Witnesses proved, that *Mary Squires* was not Guilty. There was incontestable Evidence given of *Canning*'s Ignorance, as to the Room; and also of the Inconsistences and Contradictions of her own Account and Informations: And Lastly, very full and positive Evidence was given to prove, that she was not confined in *Wells*'s Work-shop at all. There was indeed no direct Evidence to shew, that she was not robbed at Mrs. *Wells*'s; but then the Evidence to prove she was not confined there, sufficiently shews that too. For the Story of the Robbery and Confinement, are so closely connected by *Canning*, that one cannot be true, or false without the other; insomuch, that if *Canning* was robbed at Mrs. *Wells*'s, she certainly was confined in the Work-Shop there; and if she was not confined, it is equally certain, that she was not robbed. So that upon the whole of the Evidence for the Crown, there was a direct Charge of Perjury most clearly made out and proved against the Girl in such a Manner, that no Jury could acquit her consistently with their Oaths, unless she should be able in her Defence to shew the Falseness of the Evidence, and invalidate the Charge brought against her.

It has been said indeed, that no Proof whatever could be sufficient to convict her, unless it should be clearly shewn where she really was during the Month she says she was confined at Mother *Wells's*: Now, though nothing so very weak can ever have any Weight in a Court of Justice, yet as the Want of proving that Circumstance was even there insisted upon as a Matter much in Favour of her; and in order to disabuse those who may have been imposed upon without Doors by such fallacious Reasoning, the following Answer to that Objection is offered to the Reader's Consideration.

The Charge in the Indictment is for swearing that she was confined in *Wells's* House, when in Fact she was not; and therefore if Proof was given that she was not confined there, the Charge was made good, and her Perjury plainly proved. Besides, if *Canning's* Story is false (as is insisted upon on the Behalf of the Prosecution) it must have been a concerted Scheme, contrived by *Canning* and some other People, whose Names no Person who has attentively read ———— Evidence, and the other Circumstances of the Case as proved, will think it difficult to guess at. That Scheme so concerted, must have been begun to be carried into Execution before *New-Year's-Day*, and the first Part of it was the Absence and Concealment of the Girl. The Conspirators, no doubt, took Care that none should see her but themselves; which was no difficult Matter to effect; for which Reason it must be impossible for any Persons but themselves to shew her Hiding-Place; and till she or somebody concerned

cerned with her shall tell, it will remain a Secret; and therefore as to the Objection of those People who say, "If she was not at *Enfield-Wash*, where was she? She must have been somewhere, and therefore you might have easily found her out in all this Time." Let this stand for a compleat Answer, "She was hid, and hid by Confederates, who only know where she was; they *won't* tell, and Nobody else can." If they object, that no such Confederacy has been proved, tell them some of *Canning's* own Evidence have pointed strongly towards one: But if there were no Appearances upon the Trial of any such Conspiracy, yet no one, it is presumed, will deny that such a Thing is possible; and if so, it was also possible for Confederates to conceal *Canning*, and afterwards keep it a Secret. Now it would be absurd to call for that, as a necessary Proof, in order to *Canning's* Conviction, which she herself, who is the Person accused, had it in her Power, and (if guilty) no doubt would, and did prevent the Possibility of producing.

To illustrate this Matter a little farther—Suppose *Jack Hocus* should swear *Will. Trueman* had robbed him, and stripped him stark naked at *Temple-Bar*, at Noon-day, on the first of *April* last, and that he afterwards carried him through the Streets of *London*, and chained him to the Pump in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, and that he kept him there a Month together, and only brought him a Crust every Morning to live upon, and that in all that Time no Soul but *Trueman* came near him, or saw him—Suppose upon this, *Hocus* should be indicted for swearing

swearing falsely, and upon his Trial all the Shopkeepers opposite to the Pump, and half the Citizens of *London* should swear that they very frequently looked at the Pump during that Time, and neither *Jack Hocus* nor any Body else was chained there, would not all Mankind say *Jack* was guilty of Perjury without further Ceremony?—Or would there, think you, be a Man in *England* found weak enough to say, “Notwithstanding all this positive Proof, and the palpable Absurdity of *Jack’s* Tale, he most certainly was at the Pump in *St. Paul’s Church-yard*, or *somewhere else*; and therefore unless you prove where else he was during that Month, I am resolutely determin’d to believe he was chained at the Pump.”

— *Quid Rides? Mutato Nomine de te Fabula Narratur.*

Thus the Charge of Perjury being proved in such a Manner as rendered a Defence absolutely necessary, let us next consider what Proofs were requisite upon that Defence to shew such a Certainty, or at least a Probability of her Innocence, as might induce an impartial Jury to acquit her.

And first, the strongest Evidence of her Absence, and Return the 29th of *January* was highly requisite.

Secondly, The Condition she was in when she came Home, was also necessary; and, in order thereto, the Shoes, Stockings, Petticoats and Shift, should have been produced by all Means upon the Trial of *Squires* at least; and not producing them looked suspicious.

Thirdly, She should have proved, that she was not ignorant of the Room, as had been sworn against her. She should also have shewn, either that the Evidence given of her Self-contradiction was false, or that those Contradictions were only so in Appearance, and not in Reality, and that they were easily reconcileable to Truth, and to each other.

Fourthly, That some Proof of her carrying down to *Enfield-Wash* and Return was also necessary, was so apparent to her Friends themselves, that they attempted it, but miserably failed in that Attempt.

Fifthly, Above all Things, it was absolutely and indispensibly necessary to prove, by very strong Evidence, either that she really was confined in Mrs. *Wells's* House, or seen when she was carried into the House, or as she was getting out of it (both which had been often promised) or at least the Falsehood of the several Persons who swore that they had been in the Room, should have been clearly shewn.

Sixthly, It was extremely proper (though not equally necessary with the other Points insisted upon) to shew, if possible, that the Gypsey really was at *Enfield Wash* at the Time the Girl said she was robbed; and thereby to contradict the Evidence from *Abbotsbury* and other Places, who had sworn that she was elsewhere; or,

Lastly, Instead of all the above-mentioned Points, a clear and indisputable Proof of the absolute Confession of the several Parties accused by *Canning*, that they were guilty, and her Story was true, would have been a very sufficient Defence.

Let us now see what she really did prove, or attempt to prove, in her Defence.

In the first Place, her Absence from Home, or at least her Invisibilty for a Month, was proved by several Witnesses.

Her sudden Appearance again on the 29th of *January* at Night was also proved beyond all Doubt; her Condition when she came Home, and her Illness afterwards, were likewise sworn to, though with some odd Variations, which the Reader will probably recollect, but which are not of Consequence enough to deserve any Recapitulation. One Thing only should be remembered, which is, that it was not proved by any Means that her Illness was the Consequence of long fasting.

An Attempt was also made to prove, that the Account she gave of the Room and her Confinement in it, corresponded with the real Appearances of Things when the Company went to Mrs. *Wells's* on the first of *February*—How that Attempt succeeded, the Reader cannot have forgot.

The Lameness of the Evidence to her being seen on the Road has been mentioned already.

She brought several Witnesses to contradict that Part of the Evidence for the Prosecution, which has been commonly called the *Abbotsbury* Testimony.

As the Evidence of the Gypsey's being at *Abbotsbury* was a Part of the Proof given against the Girl, which of all others (even tho' true) the least affected her, and yet was the only Part of the whole Case made out against her, which she attempted to contradict or deny, it may not be amiss to observe, That

That the Farmer upon the Chace and two of his Neighbours have proved, that the Gypsies they saw had her Family with her, and even young Children, so early as the 14th of *December*; and on the 23d of that Month another Witness saw her with one of her Daughters coming out of Mrs. *Wells's* House, though indeed neither the Farmer nor his Neighbours, nor yet the last Witness, have taken upon them to swear to *Mary Squires's* Son or Daughters; but, from what they have sworn, two Things are manifest; the first, that if *Mary Squires* really was at *Enfield-Wash*, her Son and Daughters were there also; and the second, that they lodged at Mrs. *Wells's* so early as the 23d of *December*, and from thence till the first of *February*. Now how comes it to pass that not a single Witness pretended to swear to the Faces of *George*, *Mary*, or *Lucy Squires*, except one or two, who owned they had never seen any of them till within a Day or two of the very Time at which, it is, on all Hands, admitted they came there? And how comes it, that though *Mary Squires* was so frequently visible up and down the Neighbourhood, not a Creature (except the Gentleman last mention'd) ever saw her either in, or going into, or coming out of Mother *Wells's* House, or even knew, or had the least Suspicion, that any such People lodged there from the 23d of *December* till within about eight or ten Days of her being taken up? There are several Houses directly fronting Mrs. *Wells's*, and Hundreds of People are daily passing and repassing by her Door, and therefore that the Gypsies should lodge there with her

Family five Weeks together, and frequently go out into the Neighbourhood, and yet no Body see her, or any of her Family, go out or in, all of whom, had they been there, must have been as well known in the Neighbourhood as herself, exceeds all Belief.

Another Observation is, that the Witnesses in general to this Part were of the very lowest Rank, and most of them grossly illiterate and stupid, but few of them had ever spoke to her; No two of them pretended to have been in Company together when they saw her, so that it was impossible that the Testimony of one of them should clash with or contradict that of another; but then it was also impossible they should confirm one another; and there is this ugly Circumstance attending their Testimony, which is, that it looks as if the Defendant durst not call two or more Witnesses to prove seeing the Gypsey at one and the same Time, for Fear they should contradict one another, either in Regard to the Days on which they saw her, or some other material Circumstances. This is most clear, that the old Woman could not live there so long, and go out so often, without being seen by Numbers at once, unless it can be supposed that she, like the Spirits and Apparitions of good King *James's* Days, was only visible to one at a Time.

Another Thing which deserves remarking is, that some of the Witnesses plainly mistake as to Time, others recollected the Time by trifling and uncertain Circumstances which might happen every Day, and that those amongst them, who appealed to Notes or other
written

written Memorandums of a more certain Nature in Respect to Dates, left all those Evidences behind them, as if by unanimous Consent.

Canning also attempted to prove Confessions of *Mary Squires*, *Susannah Wells*, and *Judith Natus*; but, as some Remarks have been already made upon that Part of the Case, the Reader will not be displeased to have no more said about that which scarcely deserved any Answer at all.

The Imputations attempted to be thrown upon the Characters of two of the Witnesses were so entirely and satisfactorily wiped off, that *Canning* herself cannot be displeased at having no Stress at all laid upon that Matter one Way or other.

Nothing else, to the best of the Author's Memory, was proved or urged that could be any Ways material in the Girl's Defence; so that the two main Points insisted upon against her (that is to say, that she had several Times wilfully contradicted herself, more than once upon Oath, and that she never was confined nor consequently robbed in *Mother Wells's* House, and both of which had been most clearly proved upon the Trial) remains at last not only absolutely undenied and unanswered, but even unattempted to be contradicted, or to have any Kind of Answer whatsoever given to them.

Having thus cursorily related the most material Facts, no Place can be so proper for a few general Remarks.

And First, It cannot well be conceived for what Reason *Canning*, who writes a very legible Hand, should only set her Mark to her

first Informations, unless she was conscious of some Paper under her Hand, which might (if proved to be written by her) lead to the Discovery of some dark Iniquity; and therefore artfully designed, by signing her Mark, not only to prevent her being betrayed by Similitude of Hands, but also to make the Publick believe, she could not write at all.

There is also some Difficulty in supposing, that her Mother (if she really came Home in the Condition pretended) could possibly forget so far, as to swear at one Time, that she had a Cap upon her Head, and at another, that she had two Handkerchiefs on, and no Cap.

The Girl certainly bore a good Character in the Neighbourhood; but then we all know the best may err, and every one who acts amiss, must begin to do Ill at one Time or another.—This perhaps was her unhappy Beginning; and when one considers, that she had not had her Courses for three or four Months before her Absence, there can be nothing preposterous in guessing.——Miscarriages, the Learned say, have been procured by Druggs; nothing is proved indeed, and therefore nothing should be asserted.—Yet if such a Thing should ever come to Light: The Absence, the Illness on returning; the Lye to excuse both; the Perseverance in that Lye; the Evidence given by at least one Witness.—All will be accounted for on very natural Principles.

Upon the whole, it most certainly was clearly proved;

First, That the Gypsey was at *Abbotsbury*, when *Canning* pretended to have been robbed by her.

Second-

Secondly, That *Canning* knew nothing of the Room in Question, till she saw it on the 1st of February.

Thirdly, That she contradicted herself several Times.

Fourthly, That several of her Witnesses contradicted *her* themselves, and *each other*; and

Fifthly, That she was not confined as she had sworn.

And it is equally certain, that every Part of the Charge against her remains unanswered, except the *Abbotsbury* Testimony.—And the Answer to that, was such as in its own Nature confuted itself; and even if it had not done so, was by no Means equal in weight to the Evidence on the other Side.

Let us now reflect a Moment, and we cannot but perceive, that if the Girl is *innocent*, all the Witnesses to prove the Gypsey's Absence, all the Evidence of *Canning's* Ignorance of the Room, her Inconsistencies and Contradictions, and all those who proved that she was not confined in *Wells's* House, in Number more than Fifty, are to a Man fore-sworn, corruptly, wilfully forsworn: A Thought too horrid to be harboured in the Breast of any, but the Man, whose own abandoned Principles have led him to suppose, that the whole human Race are as wicked as himself.

On the other Hand, if the Girl is *guilty*, it does not follow necessarily, that *any one* of all her Witnesses is perjured; for though there is an irreconcilable Contradiction between the Testimony from *Abbotsbury* and that from *Ensfeld-Wash*, yet it is very easy to suppose, that the
People

3/88
x/1

BML

11 B I 4
K

People from this last Place have sworn truly, as they apprehend, being most of them mistaken only as to Time. Some few of them indeed seem to have mistaken the Person of the Gypsey; and as to all Canning's other Witnesses, their Evidence may be strictly true, though Canning should be guilty; for there is nothing in all their Testimony, which contradicts, or any Ways impeaches the least Part of the Charge against her. Who therefore can believe a Story contradicted by above fifty Witnesses, and strictly speaking, supported by none? A Story so absurdly improbable, that it would hardly deserve Credit, tho' supported by 100 Witnesses, and contradicted by no Creature; Who that will fairly and coolly weigh the Evidence on both Sides (which they'll soon have the Opportunity of doing, by an attentive Perusal of the Trial, which will be found to corroborate in every Instance the Truth of the above Reflections) would not absolutely reject this ridiculous Story, though the unavoidable Consequence should be no less than that of pronouncing *Elizabeth Canning* guilty of the blackest Perjury.

Although the Hury in which these Sheets were written, from the Necessity of publishing something, in order to check the Progress of those groundless Clamors, which have been industriously raised, may have occasioned some Inaccuracies and trifling Mistakes; yet it is hoped they may, upon the Whole, be of great Service, towards clearing up this intricate Story.—Not by informing the Publick of Particulars which they may have heard of already, from almost every Quarter, but by digesting these Particulars into a regular Method, and shewing their natural Tendency and Connection, which will enable the Generality of Readers to judge for themselves with greater Ease when they shall read the Trial; which (tho' the only Piece that can give full and proper Satisfaction to the Publick) may not at first, on account of its Length, and the Want of some such Observations as the above, elucidate the Affair so very clearly to the Comprehension of every Reader.



irreconcilable Contradiction between the Testimony of the Gypsies and the Evidence of the Witnesses from England. In the Note, Page 14. for high, read long People
90096045